

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 remain pending in the application.

The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider earlier rejections in light of the following remarks. No new issues are raised nor is further search required as a result of the changes made herein. Entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 8, 11 and 12 over Bar in view of Thomas

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 8, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,456,852 to Bar et al. ("Bar") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0060212 to Thomas ("Thomas"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1, 2, 8, 11 and 12 recite a forwarder to forward a registration notification message from a signaling transfer point to a mobile activity status tracker.

Bar appears to disclose a system for distributing real time location information of cellular telephones to various third party information subscribers comprising an HTTP server (Abstract). Location information is sent from individual base station sites to metro hubs (See Bar, Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 25-36). The hubs are connected to a database server (See Bar, Fig. 1). The database server is connected to the Internet to allow Internet access to location information (See Bar, Fig. 1 and col. 4, lines 42-65).

Bar relies on location information being sent from metro hubs to a database server. However, Bar fails to give any further details of the type of messages being transferred within the network. Thus, Bar fails to disclose use of a registration notification message, much less disclose or suggest a forwarder to forward a registration notification message from a signaling transfer point to a mobile activity status tracker, recited by claims 1, 2, 8, 11 and 12.

Thomas appears to disclose a system for location tracking, location utilization, and dissemination and management of location information (See paragraph 0024). Each mobile unit can obtain location information on its location and forward the location information to a location monitoring server (web server)

(See Thomas, paragraph 0028). Alternately, the location information can be provided from a wireless network (See Thomas, paragraph 0028).

Thomas discloses that location information can be provided from a wireless network to a location monitoring server. However, Thomas fails to disclose use of a registration notification message for any reason,. Thomas, like Bar, fails to disclose or suggest use of either a registration notification message or a home location register, much less disclose or suggest a forwarder to forward a registration notification message from a signaling transfer point to a mobile activity status tracker, recited by claims 1, 2, 8, 11 and 12.

Thus, even if it were obvious to modify Bar with the disclosure of Thomas the theoretical result would fail to disclose or suggest use of either a registration notification message or a home location register, much less disclose or suggest a forwarder to forward a registration notification message from a signaling transfer point to a mobile activity status tracker, recited by claims 1, 2, 8, 11 and 12.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1, 2, 8, 11 and 12 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 4, 9 and 10 over Bar in view of Thomas and Gossman

In the Office Action, claims 3, 4, 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Bar in view of Thomas, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,181,935 to Gossman et al. ("Gossman"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 3, 4, 9 and 10 recite a forwarder to forward a registration notification message from a signaling transfer point to a mobile activity status tracker.

As discussed above, Bar in view of Thomas fails to disclose or suggest a forwarder to forward a registration notification message from a signaling transfer point to a mobile activity status tracker, as recited by claims 3, 4, 9 and 10.

Gossman is directed to a system and method of translating between different protocols to transmit customized services to a wireless network (Abstract). Location information is obtained from subscriber profiles in a Home Location Register (See Gossman, col. 10, lines 14-21).

Thus, Gossman relies on a HLR to obtain location information. Gossman fails to disclose or suggest use of a registration notification message in any context, much less disclose or suggest a forwarder to forward a registration notification message from a signaling transfer point to a mobile activity status tracker, as recited by claims 3, 4, 9 and 10.

Moreover, even if it were obvious to modify Bar with the disclosure of Thomas and Gossman (which it is not since the two references are directed toward completely different problems within the art), the theoretical result would STILL fail to disclose or suggest use of a registration notification message for any purpose or transferring such a message between any elements, much less disclose or suggest a forwarder to forward a registration notification message from a signaling transfer point to a mobile activity status tracker, as recited by claims 3, 4, 9 and 10.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 3, 4, 9 and 10 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 5, 6, 13-15, 18-21 and 24-27 over Bar in view of Thomas and Berggren

In the Office Action, claims 5, 6, 13-15, 18-21 and 24-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Bar in view of Thomas, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,073,015 to Berggren et al. ("Berggren"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 5 and 6 recite a forwarder to forward a registration notification message from a signaling transfer point to a mobile activity status tracker.

As discussed above, Bar in view of Thomas fails to disclose or

suggest a forwarder to forward a registration notification message from a signaling transfer point to a mobile activity status tracker, as recited by claims 5 and 6.

The Examiner alleges that Berggren discloses forwarding a registration notification message from a Home Location Register to a mobile activity status tracker at col. 8, lines 30-55 (See Office Action, page 6). The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Berggren at col. 8, lines 44-47 describes a mobility server that updates location information of a subscriber unit with a HLR. Berggren at col. 8, lines 30-55 fails to even mention use of a registration notification message or forwarding of any type of message, much less disclose or suggest a forwarder to forward a registration notification message from a signaling transfer point to a mobile activity status tracker, as recited by claims 5 and 6.

Thus, even if it were obvious to modify Bar with the disclosure of Thomas and Berggren (which it is not since the THREE references are directed toward completely different problems within the art), the theoretical result would STILL obtain location information from a HLR, **NOT** disclosing or suggesting a forwarder to forward a registration notification message from a signaling transfer point to a mobile activity status tracker, as recited by claims 5 and 6.

Claims 13-15, 18-21 and 24-27 recite forwarding a registration notification message sent to a Home Location Register to a mobile activity status tracker.

As discussed above, Bar relies on various techniques of determining location that are based on propagation of a telephone signal through a cellular network. Bar fails to disclose or suggest use of a registration notification message for any reason, much less disclose or suggest forwarding a registration notification message sent to a Home Location Register to a mobile activity status tracker, recited by claims 13-15, 18-21 and 24.

Thomas mentions registration in the context of a registration request from a user to view location information from a user's computer (See paragraph 0039). Thomas fails to mention use of a registration notification

message for any purpose, a term of art in the wireless communications art, much less disclose or suggest forwarding a registration notification message sent to a Home Location Register to a mobile activity status tracker, as recited by claims 13-15, 18-21 and 24.

As discussed above, the Examiner alleges that Berggren discloses forwarding a registration notification message from a Home Location Register to a mobile activity status tracker at col. 8, lines 30-55 (See Office Action, page 6). The Applicants respectfully disagree.

As discussed above, Berggren at col. 8, lines 44-47 describes a mobility server that updates location information of a subscriber unit with a HLR. Berggren at col. 8, lines 30-55 fails to even mention use of a registration notification message or forwarding of any type of message, much less disclose or suggest forwarding to a mobile activity status tracker a registration notification message sent to a Home Location Register, as recited by claims 13-15, 18-21 and 24-27.

Thus, even if it were obvious to modify Bar with the disclosure of Thomas and Berggren (which it is not since the two references are directed toward completely different problems within the art), the theoretical result would at best result in a mobility server that updates location information of a subscriber unit with a HLR. Bar modified by Thomas and Berggren would STILL fail to disclose or suggest forwarding a registration notification message sent to a Home Location Register to a mobile activity status tracker, as recited by claims 13-15, 18-21 and 24-27.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 5, 6, 13-15, 18-21 and 24-27 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 7, 16, 17, 22, 23 and 28 over Bar in view of Thomas, Berggren and Gossman

In the Office Action, claims 7, 16, 17, 22, 23 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Bar in view of Thomas,

Berggren, and further in view of Gossman. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 7, 16, 17, 22, 23 and 28 are dependent on claims 1, 13, 19 and 25 respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 13, 19 and 25.

Claim 7 recites a forwarder to forward a registration notification message from a signaling transfer point to a mobile activity status tracker.

As discussed above, Bar in view of Thomas and Berggren fails to disclose or suggest a forwarder to forward a registration notification message from a signaling transfer point to a mobile activity status tracker, as recited by claim 7.

As discussed above, Gossman relies on information stored in a HLR. Gossman fails to disclose or suggest moving a a registration notification message between any elements within a wireless network, much less disclose or suggest a forwarder to forward a registration notification message from a signaling transfer point to a mobile activity status tracker, as recited by claim 7.

Thus, Bar modified by the disclosure of Thomas, Berggren, and further in view of Gossman would STILL fail to disclose or suggest a forwarder to forward a registration notification message from a signaling transfer point to a mobile activity status tracker, as recited by claim 7.

Claims 16, 17, 22, 23 and 28 recite forwarding to a mobile activity status tracker a registration notification message sent to a Home Location.

As discussed above, Bar in view of Thomas and Berggren fails to disclose or suggest forwarding a registration notification message sent to a Home Location to a mobile activity status tracker, as recited by claims 16, 17, 22, 23 and 28.

As discussed above, Gossman, like Berggren, relies on a HLR for a determination of location of a wireless device. However, Gossman, like Berggren, fails to disclose or suggest forwarding a registration notification message sent to a Home Location to a mobile activity status tracker, as recited by claims 16, 17, 22, 23 and 28.

Thus, Bar modified by the disclosure of Thomas, Berggren and Gossman (if it were obvious which it is not since each reference is directed to different problems within the art) would at best result in a mobility server that updates location information of a subscriber unit with a HLR. Bar in view of Thomas, Berggren and Gossman fails to disclose or suggest forwarding a registration notification message sent to a Home Location to a mobile activity status tracker, as recited by claims 16, 17, 22, 23 and 28.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 7, 16, 17, 22, 23 and 28 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



William H. Bollman
Reg. No.: 36,457
Tel. (202) 261-1020
Fax. (202) 887-0336

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC
2000 M Street, N.W. 7th Floor
Washington D.C. 20036-3307
WHB/df